

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CYBERFONE SYSTEMS, LLC (formerly)	
known as LVL PATENT GROUP, LLC),)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	C.A. No. 11-827 (SLR)
v.)	
)	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
CELLCO PARTNERSHIP, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**ANSWER OF SPRINT SPECTRUM LP TO CYBERFONE'S FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

Defendant Sprint Spectrum LP ("Sprint") responds to the allegations of the First Amended Complaint ("FAC") as follows:

PARTIES

1. Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.
2. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.
3. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.
4. Sprint admits that it is a Delaware limited partnership. Sprint denies any remaining allegations of this paragraph.

5. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

6. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

7. Sprint admits that Virgin Mobile USA, L.P. ("Virgin Mobile") is a Delaware limited partnership. Sprint denies any remaining allegations of this paragraph.

8. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

9. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

10. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

11. Sprint admits that Boost Mobile, LLC (“Boost”) is a Delaware limited liability company. Sprint denies any remaining allegations of this paragraph.

12. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

13. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

14. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

15. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

16. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

17. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

18. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

19. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

20. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

21. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

22. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without

knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

23. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

24. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

25. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

26. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

27. Sprint admits that the FAC purports to collectively refer to Verizon, AT&T, Sprint, T-Mobile, Cricket, Virgin, U.S. Cellular, MetroPCS, TracFone, and Boost as “Wireless Carriers.”

28. Sprint admits that the FAC purports to collectively refer to Apple, RIM, Nokia, Samsung, Motorola, HTC, Sharp, Pantech, LG, HP, Sony, Ericsson, Casio, Huawei, ZTE, and Kyocera as “Wireless Handset Manufacturers.”

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

29. Sprint admits that Plaintiff brings this action under the patent laws of the United States and purports to base subject matter jurisdiction on 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a). Sprint denies that this action has any merit as to it and otherwise denies the allegations of this paragraph.

30. Sprint does not contest that it is subject to personal jurisdiction or that venue is proper in this action. Sprint otherwise denies the allegations of this paragraph that pertain to it. Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph as to other defendants and therefore denies the allegations.

COUNT I
(Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,044,382)

31. Sprint admits that a copy of United States Patent No. 6,044,382 (“the ‘382 patent”), entitled “Data Transaction Assembly Server,” is attached as Exhibit A to the FAC, and that the ‘382 patent states on its face that it issued on March 28, 2000. Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

32. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

33. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

34. Sprint denies the allegations of this paragraph.

35. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

36. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

37. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

38. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

39. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without

knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

40. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

41. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

42. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

43. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

44. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

45. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

46. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

47. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

48. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

49. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

50. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without

knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

51. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

52. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

53. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

54. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

55. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

56. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

57. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

58. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

59. Sprint denies the allegations of this paragraph to the extent they are directed to it. Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of this paragraph as to other defendants and therefore denies those allegations.

60. Sprint denies the allegations of this paragraph to the extent they are directed to it. Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of this paragraph as to other defendants and therefore denies those allegations.

COUNT II
(Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5,805,676)

61. Sprint admits that a copy of United States Patent No. 5,805,676 (“the ‘676 patent”), entitled “Telephone/Transaction Entry Device and System for Entering Transaction

Data Into Databases,” is attached as Exhibit B to the FAC, and that the ‘676 patent states on its face that it issued on September 8, 1998. Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

62. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

63. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

64. Sprint denies the allegations of this paragraph.

65. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

66. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

67. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without

knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

68. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

69. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

70. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

71. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

72. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

73. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

74. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

75. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

76. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

77. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

78. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without

knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

79. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

80. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

81. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

82. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

83. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

84. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

85. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

86. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

87. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

88. Sprint denies the allegations of this paragraph to the extent they are directed to it. Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of this paragraph as to other defendants and therefore denies those allegations.

89. Sprint denies the allegations of this paragraph to the extent they are directed to it. Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the

truth of the remaining allegations of this paragraph as to other defendants and therefore denies those allegations.

COUNT III
(Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,103)

90. Sprint admits that a copy of United States Patent No. 5,987,103 (“the ‘103 patent”), entitled “Telephone/Transaction Entry Device and System for Entering Transaction Data Into Databases,” is attached as Exhibit C to the FAC, and that the ‘103 patent states on its face that it issued on November 16, 1999. Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

91. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

92. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

93. Sprint denies the allegations of this paragraph.

94. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

95. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

96. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

97. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

98. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

99. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

100. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without

knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

101. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

102. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

103. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

104. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

105. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

106. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

107. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

108. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

109. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

110. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

111. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without

knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

112. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

113. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

114. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

115. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

116. Sprint denies the allegations of this paragraph to the extent they are directed to it. Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of this paragraph as to other defendants and therefore denies those allegations.

117. Sprint denies the allegations of this paragraph to the extent they are directed to it. Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of this paragraph as to other defendants and therefore denies those allegations.

COUNT IV
(Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 8,019,060)

118. Sprint admits that a copy of United States Patent No. 8,019,060 (“the ‘060 patent”), entitled “Telephone/Transaction Entry Device and System for Entering Transaction Data Into Databases,” is attached as Exhibit D to the FAC, and that the ‘060 patent states on its face that it issued on September 13, 2011. Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

119. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

120. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

121. Sprint denies the allegations of this paragraph.

122. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without

knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

123. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

124. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

125. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

126. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

127. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

128. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

129. Sprint denies the allegations of this paragraph to the extent they are directed to it. Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of this paragraph as to other defendants and therefore denies those allegations.

130. Sprint denies the allegations of this paragraph to the extent they are directed to it. Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of this paragraph as to other defendants and therefore denies those allegations.

COUNT V
(Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7,334,024)

131. Sprint admits that a copy of United States Patent No. 7,334,024 (“the ‘024 patent”), entitled “System for Transmission of Voice and Data over the Same Communications Line,” is attached as Exhibit E to the FAC, and that the ‘024 patent states on its face that it issued on February 19, 2008. Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

132. This paragraph concerns a different defendant than Sprint and therefore does not require a response from Sprint. To the extent a response is required, Sprint is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph and therefore denies the allegations.

ANSWER TO CYBERFONE'S PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Sprint denies that CyberFone is entitled to any of the relief requested in its prayer for relief.

DEFENSES

Without any admission as to the burden of proof or as to any of the allegations in the FAC, except as expressly admitted above, Sprint asserts the following defenses. Sprint reserves the right to raise additional defenses as they become known through further investigation and discovery.

First Defense

The FAC fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted against Sprint and/or fails to plead the required allegations with sufficient particularity.

Second Defense

Sprint has not infringed any valid claim of the '382, '676, '103, or '060 patents (collectively "the asserted patents").

Third Defense

One or more claims of the asserted patents are invalid under one or more sections of the Patent Act, Title 35 of the United States Code, including, but not limited to, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112.

Fourth Defense

CyberFone is estopped from asserting any interpretation of the asserted patents that would be broad enough to cover any of Sprint's methods, products or services alleged to infringe the asserted patents, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

Fifth Defense

CyberFone's claims are barred in whole or in part by the doctrines of waiver, laches, acquiescence, estoppel, implied license, and/or other equitable remedies.

Sixth Defense

CyberFone's claim for damages is barred, in whole or in part, for failure to comply with 35 U.S.C. §§ 286, 287 and/or 288.

Seventh Defense

CyberFone's claims for relief are barred in whole or in part by prosecution history estoppel and/or prosecution history disclaimer.

Eighth Defense

CyberFone is not entitled to injunctive relief as it has, at a minimum, an adequate remedy at law and will not suffer any irreparable harm.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Sprint requests that the Court enter judgment in favor of Sprint and against CyberFone on each of CyberFone's claims and further requests that the Court:

- (A) deny each request for relief made by CyberFone, and dismiss the FAC with prejudice as to Sprint;
- (B) deem this to be an exceptional case and award Sprint its attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285;
- (C) award Sprint its costs and expenses; and
- (D) award Sprint such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Sprint demands a trial by jury of all issues triable by jury.

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP

/s/ Regina S.E. Murphy

Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)

Karen Jacobs Loudon (#2881)

Regina S.E. Murphy (#5648)

1201 N. Market Street

P.O. Box 1347

Wilmington, DE 19899-1347

(302) 658-9200

jblumenfeld@mnat.com

kloudon@mnat.com

rmurphy@mnat.com

Attorneys for Sprint Spectrum LP

May 21, 2012

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on May 21, 2012 I electronically filed the foregoing document, which will send notification of such filing(s) to all registered participants.

I also certify that copies were caused to be served on May 21, 2012 upon the following in the manner indicated:

Richard D. Kirk, Esquire
Stephen B. Brauerman, Esquire
Vanessa R. Tiradentes, Esquire
BAYARD, P.A.
222 Delaware Avenue, Suite 900
Wilmington, DE 19891
Attorneys for Plaintiff

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Marc A. Fenster, Esquire
Bruce K. Kuyper, Esquire
Fredericka Ung, Esquire
RUSS, AUGUST & KABAT
12424 Wilshire Boulevard, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1031
Attorneys for Plaintiff

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Collins J. Seitz, Jr., Esquire
David E. Ross, Esquire
Benjamin Schladweiler, Esquire
SEITZ ROSS ARONSTAM & MORITZ LLP
100 S. West Street, Suite 400
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 576-1600
Attorneys for Cellco Partnership

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Michael K. Kellogg, Esquire
Evan T. Leo, Esquire
Wan J. Kim, Esquire
Michael E. Joffre, Esquire
Kiran S. Raj, Esquire
KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD,
EVANS, & FIGEL PLLC
1615 M Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036
Attorneys for Cellco Partnership

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

John G. Day, Esquire
Tiffany Geyer Lydon, Esquire
Andrew C. Mayo, Esquire
ASHBY & GEDDES
500 Delaware Avenue
P.O. Box 1150
Wilmington, DE 19899
*Attorneys for AT&T Mobility LLC and ZTE
(USA) Inc.*

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Evan Finkel, Esquire
Mark R. Kendrick, Esquire
Michael Horikawa, Esquire
James Chang, Esquire
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Attorneys for AT&T Mobility LLC

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

William P. Atkins, Esquire
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 1400
McLean, VA 22102
Attorneys for AT&T Mobility LLC

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Barry W. Graham, Esquire
Yanbin Xu, Esquire
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER L.L.P.
901 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 2004-4413
Attorneys for ZTE (USA) Inc.

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Karen Jacobs Loudon, Esquire
MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP
1201 North Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
*Attorneys for Sprint Spectrum L.P., Boost
Mobile, LLC, HTC America, Inc. and
Futurewei Technologies, Inc. (d/b/a Huawei)*

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Daniel R. Foster, Esquire
MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY LLP
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1700
Irvine, CA 92614-2559
Attorneys for HTC America, Inc.

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Yar R. Chaikovsky, Esquire
John A. Lee, Esquire
Cary Chien, Esquire
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
275 Middletown Road, Suite 100
Menlo Park, CA 94025
*Attorneys for Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
(d/b/a Huawei)*

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Jack B. Blumenfeld, Esquire
MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP
1201 North Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19899
*Attorneys for T-Mobile USA Inc., Motorola
Mobility, Inc., Cricket Communications Inc.,
MetroPCS Wireless Inc. and TracFone
Wireless Inc.*

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Ryan J. McBrayer, Esquire
Kirstin E. Larson, Esquire
PERKINS COIE LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, WA 98101-3099
Attorneys for T-Mobile USA Inc.

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Jonathan E. Retsky, Esquire
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
35 W. Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60601-9703
Attorneys for Motorola Mobility, Inc.

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Steven J. Pollinger, Esquire
McKool Smith
300 W. 6th Street, Suite 1700
Austin, TX 78701
Attorneys for MetroPCS Wireless, Inc.

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Brett E. Cooper, Esquire
MCKOOL SMITH
One Bryant Park, 47th Floor
New York, NY 10036
Attorneys for MetroPCS Wireless, Inc.

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Michael L. Brody, Esquire
Jonathan E. Retsky, Esquire
Thomas M. Williams, Esquire
James Winn, Esquire
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
35 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60601
*Attorneys for TracFone Wireless, Inc. and
Cricket Communications, Inc.*

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Krishnan Padmanabhan, Esquire
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166-4193
*Attorneys for TracFone Wireless, Inc. and
Cricket Communications, Inc.*

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Mary B. Graham, Esquire
MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP
1201 N. Market Street
P.O. Box 1347
Wilmington, DE 19899
*Attorneys for Sony Ericsson Mobile
Communication (USA) Inc.*

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Justin E. Pierce, Esquire
Jeffri A. Kaminski, Esquire
VENABLE LLP
575 7th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
*Attorneys for Sony Ericsson Mobile
Communications (USA), Inc.*

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Richard L. Horwitz, Esquire
David Ellis Moore, Esquire
POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON
1313 N. Market Street
P.O. Box 951
Wilmington, DE 19801
*Attorneys for Apple Inc. and NEC CASIO
Mobile Communications, Ltd.*

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Harrison J. Frahn IV, Esquire
Jason M. Bussey, Esquire
Jeffrey E. Danley, Esquire
SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT LLP
2550 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, CA 94304
Attorneys for Apple Inc.

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Scott D. Stimpson, Esquire
Katherine M. Lieb, Esquire
David C. Lee, Esquire
Trent S. Dickey, Esquire
SILLS CUMMIS & GROSS P.C.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112
*Attorneys for NEC CASIO Mobile
Communications, Ltd.*

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Steven J. Fineman, Esquire
Gregory P. Williams, Esquire
RICHARDS, LAYTON & FINGER, PA
920 N. King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
*Attorneys for United States Cellular
Corporation*

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Robert D. Leighton, Esquire
Richard J. O'Brien, Esquire
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
One South Dearborn
Chicago, IL 60603
*Attorneys for United States Cellular
Corporation*

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Jeffrey L. Moyer, Esquire
Elizabeth R. He, Esquire
RICHARDS, LAYTON & FINGER, PA
920 N. King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
Attorneys for Nokia Inc.

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Robert F. Perry, Esquire
Allison H. Altersohn, Esquire
Mark H. Francis, Esquire
Charles D. Lee, Esquire
KING & SPALDING LLP
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
Attorneys for Nokia Inc.

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Chad S.C. Stover, Esquire
CONNOLLY, BOVE, LODGE & HUTZ
The Nemours Building
1007 N. Orange Street
P.O. Box 2207
Wilmington, DE 19899
Attorneys for Research In Motion

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Dominic E. Massa, Esquire
Dana O. Burwell, Esquire
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE
AND DORR LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
Attorneys for Research In Motion

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Christopher R. Noyes, Esquire
Omar Khan, Esquire
Andrea Pacelli, Esquire
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE
AND DORR LLP
399 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10022
Attorneys for Research In Motion

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Richard K. Herrmann, Esquire
Mary B. Matterer, Esquire
MORRIS JAMES LLP
500 Delaware Ave., Suite 1500
Attorneys for Pantech Wireless, Inc.

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Alan A. Wright, Esquire
Wayne M. Helge, Esquire
H.S. PARK & ASSOCIATES, PLC
850 Leesburg Pike, Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Attorneys for Pantech Wireless, Inc.

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Denise Seaston Kraft, Esquire
Aleine Michelle Porterfield, Esquire
DLA PIPER LLP
919 N. Market Street, Suite 1500
Wilmington, DE 19801
Attorneys for Sharp Electronics Corporation

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Richard de Bodo, Esquire
Andrew Devkar, Esquire
DLA PIPER LLP (US)
2000 Avenue of the Stars
Suite 400 North Tower
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Attorneys for Sharp Electronics Corporation

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Rex A. Donnelly, IV, Esquire
RATNERPRESTIA
1007 Orange Street, Suite 1100
Wilmington, DE 19801
Attorneys for Hewlett-Packard Company

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

M. Elizabeth Day, Esquire
Marc C. Belloli, Esquire
Sal Lim, Esquire
FEINBERG DAY ALBERTI & THOMPSON LLP
401 Florence Street, Suite 200
Palo Alto, CA 94301
Attorneys for Hewlett-Packard Company

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Karen L. Pascale, Esquire
James L. Higgins, Esquire
YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR LLP
Rodney Square
1000 North King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
*Attorneys for LG Electronics MobileComm
U.S.A., Inc.*

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

R. Tyler Goodwyn, IV, Esquire
Song K. Jung, Esquire
Renzo N. Rocchegiani, Esquire
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
*Attorneys for LG Electronics MobileComm
U.S.A., Inc.*

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

John W. Shaw, Esquire
Andrew E. Russell, Esquire
SHAW KELLER LLP
300 Delaware Avenue, Suite 1120
Wilmington, DE 19801
Attorneys for Kyocera Communications Inc.

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

David C. Doyle, Esquire
M. Andrew Woodmansee, Esquire
E. Dale Buxton II, Esquire
Mary Prendergast, Esquire
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
12531 High Bluff Drive
San Diego, CA 92130-2040
Attorneys for Kyocera Communications Inc.

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Adam W. Poff, Esquire
Pilar G. Kraman, Esquire
YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP
Rodney Square
1000 North King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
*Attorneys for Samsung Telecommunications
America, LLC*

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Cono Carrano, Esquire
Jin-Suk Park, Esquire
Amanda Johnson, Esquire
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
*Attorneys for Samsung Telecommunications
America, LLC*

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Kellie M. Johnson, Esquire
AKIN GUMP STAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
1700 Pacific Avenue, Suite 4100
Dallas, TX 75201
*Attorneys for Samsung Telecommunications
America, LLC*

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

/s/ Regina S.E. Murphy

Regina S.E. Murphy (#5648)